equivalent to 8 *paras* and 8 *edangalies*, one *para* being equal to 640 cubic inches. At the last Settlement, the *kotta* measure underwent a further change and was fixed at 8 *paras* and 6½ *edangalies*, one *para* being equal to 800 cubic inches. The land measure also was defined at the Settlement by fixing one *para* of seed-sowing land as equivalent to 14 cents. The rates of assessment were calculated on this basis in all parts of the State except Nanjinad and Shencotta. It was not known why a *kotta* of seed-sowing land also was not fixed on the acreage basis. It would only be fair if instead of taking 1 *kotta* of land as equivalent to one acre, it was made equal to 7½ *paras* of seed-sowing land and 1 *kotta* of grain measure also be standardised like that. The assessment should also be fixed on this basis. If the assessment had been fixed like that at the Settlement the Nanjinad ryots would have had no grievance.

Again, there was no justification in having varied rates of assessment in the taluks of the same Division. The tax on wet lands in the old Padmanabhapuram and Trivandrum Divisions was commuted into money in the same way *viz*., half at 6 chs. a *para* and half at 11 chs. a *para* of paddy. Such being the case, there was no justification in having different rates of assessment in the several taluks. Whatever rates were adopted in one taluk should be adopted in other taluks also. The average assessment per acre of wet land in the whole State was Rs. 2 ch. 26 c. 2 while the average rate in Nanjinad was Rs. 12 per acre, the minimum rate being in the Kunnatnad taluk *viz*., Rs. 1¼ per acre. Steps should be taken to reduce this wide disparity.

In conclusion, the member prayed that the land measure in Nanjinad be adopted on the same basis as in other parts of the State by fixing 1 acre as equivalent to 7½ *paras* of seed-sowing land instead of fixing 1 acre as equivalent to 1 *kotta* of seed-sowing land. Secondly, the assessment on single crop wet lands should be fixed in terms of the standard *para* as varying from 7 times the seed-growing capacity to 2/5 of that, there being 14 *tarams* of assessment. Similarly, the assessment on double crop wet lands should be fixed as varying from 10½ times the seed-sowing capacity to 3/5 of that there being 14 *tarams* in their case also. From the rates so fixed *tarisu* allowance should be made for the areas covered by bunds, etc. The commutation also should be made on the above basis.

DEWAN'S REPLY: Mr. Kaliam Pillai, all the points which you have mentioned have been noted by Government; and they will and can only be considered at the next Settlement.

3. Registry of poramboke lands and commutation rate fixed for tax on pandarapattam lands.

MR. KANDA PILLAI KALI PILLAI (*Chirayinkil taluk, Group I*) spoke about the difficulties experienced by the people in regard to *porambokes* adjacent to registered holdings. In the old records the boundaries of registered holdings adjoining rivers, canals, etc., were described with reference to such *porambokes*. In demarcating these *porambokes*, the demarcation stones were planted well inside the adjoining registered holdings in order that the stones might not be washed away by the rivers or canals. In the case of lanes, the

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

stones were planted inside the registered holdings so as to prevent obstruction to traffic. But, subsequently, the intervening space between the demarcation stones and the actual boundaries of the *porambokes* was also treated as *poramboke* and cases were taken against the occupants under the Land Conservancy Regulation and they were fined and asked to pay prohibitory assessment. This was hard. In some such cases, the people have obtained redress through civil courts which declared that the so called *porambokes* were no real *porambokes* at all. But it was not possible for every person to seek remedy in the civil courts as such a course was costly. The member therefore prayed that the strips of land lying between registered lands and the adjoining *prambokes* should be assigned to the registry holders.

He next said that in 22 of the 31 *pakuthies* of the Chirayinkil taluk, the commutation rate for tax on *pandaravaka* lands was 11 chs. per *para* of paddy while in the other 9 *pakuthies* the tax was recovered in kind. From 1102, however, the tax on seven of the nine *pakuthies* which belong to the *Sripadam* was commuted into money. But the rate was not fixed. While the rate was 6 *fanams* per *para* of paddy till 1105, it was 5 *fanams* in 1106 and 4½ *fanams* in 1107. It was not proper that different rates were applied to the same class of lands in a taluk. The member therefore requested that the commutation rate should be made uniform and fixed at 11 chs. a *para* of paddy.

DEWAN'S REPLY : Mr. Kali Pillai, you complained about the difficulties in regard to *porambokes*. If any specific cases of hardship are brought to notice, they will be investigated. But it is now a settled fact that *porambokes* are reserved for public or communal purposes and that they should not be encroached upon.

The *Sripadam* lands are freehold lands and the Government cannot interfere with them. If you have anything to urge about them, you have to approach the *Sripadam* authorities.

4. Grievances of the tenants under the Edapalli Chief.

MR. C. G. VARGHESE (*Tiruvalla taluk, Group I*) said that he was voicing forth the grievances of the tenants of the Edapalli Chief with special reference to the tenants of the Kalluppara pakuthi in the Tiruvalla taluk who formed a majority of them. One of the outstanding grievances was the recovery of tax in kind. While the system of taxation in kind in respect of Government lands was abolished so long ago as 1081, it was still upheld by the Chief. The system was subject to several drawbacks. The tax-payer had to take the paddy to the Provertikar, wait for his convenience and measure out the paddy to the satisfaction of the latter. In practice, the tax was paid only in money at such rates as were fixed by the Provertikar although the receipts were given for the paddy tax. The system while it did not benefit the Chief was a source of hardship, annoyance and humiliation to the tenants. The tax should therefore be commuted into money and in fixing the commutation rate the principle laid down in the Royal Proclamation dated the 24th February 1886 should be followed. The fact that, unlike the Sirkar, the Chief does not spend any

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly